

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 30 are currently pending in the application. Claim 2 has been amended to make the grammatical revision suggested by the Examiner. Claim 22 has been amended to delete the redundant use of the word "and." No new matter has been added with this amendment.

Claims 1 - 30 have been rejected as being obvious over Disclosed Prior Art (identified as applicant's specification, pp. 1 - 7 and fig 1 - 2) in view of Jones (Jones, Gerald Everett. How to Lie with Charts. iUniverse, February 1, 2000. pp. 61 - 67, 70 - 72, 85 - 87, 170, 175, 258 and 262). This rejection is traversed.

At the outset, it should be understood that the subject matter of this invention is related to requesting bids and receiving sell bids through a network, and that the network is not required to be the Internet (World Wide Web) as was assumed in the office action. That is, in one aspect of the invention, the buyers and sellers could be within a single organization and the invention could be practiced on an intranet or a corporate network. As an example of this aspect of the invention, General Electric Corporation (GE) energy division is building a new facility, and the division responsible for the construction of the new facility may request bids for lighting and other fixtures from GE subsidiaries located throughout the world. These request for bids and sell bids could be exchanged through an internal network. The bid requests could include an attribute for shipping costs in addition to cost of item. Hence, different manufacturing locations may have the same or a similar item price, but the total cost including shipping may be significantly different.

If the subject invention only used the graphical capabilities of the Internet in the form of web pages, as suggested in the office action, the subject invention would be limited by the filter capabilities and display capabilities of the web pages presented by the Internet search engines. These graphical presentations would not have the filtering and display capabilities specific to the subject invention (i.e., "creating a graphical visual interface based on a Cartesian coordinate system, the graphical user

interface showing a relationship in a graphical format between the at least one attribute and the at least one bid and associated attribute value in a single display”.

As set forth in the claims, the subject invention simultaneously provides a graphical display in Cartesian coordinate system together with the display of the detailed and/or general information in a visual or textual presentation. This is not a capability currently provided over the Internet or discussed in the referenced material.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Figure 5 (for example) of the present application. Claim 1 specifies creating a graphical visual interface based on a Cartesian coordinate system, the graphical user interface showing a relationship in graphical format between the at least one attribute (see attributes a1-a4 on the X axis of Figure 5) and the at least one bid and associated attribute value (see merit on Y axis of Figure 5) in a single display. In the office action, these requirements of claim 1 have been overlooked, and it has been erroneously concluded that "Utilization of a Cartesian coordination system to display and/or graph data is old and well known ..." This incorrectly implies that the present invention is a simple utilization of a Cartesian coordination system. However, the present invention does not simply utilize a Cartesian coordinate system as can best be seen in Figures 5-14 of the patent application, and as is specified in claim 1. The application teaches, and claim 1 specifies a unique coordinate system where a Cartesian coordinate system embeds a parallel coordinate system. The coordinates of the Cartesian system represent two dimensions of the decision system, which are attributes and merit (of individual bids). In addition, the system contains a parallel coordinate system within the Cartesian system. A parallel coordinate system provides a practical way of displaying multidimensional data sets. Visualization of higher (i.e., more than three) dimensional geometry with the traditional Cartesian coordinate system where all axes are mutually perpendicular is difficult. Because we live in a three-dimensional world, understanding the space involved with a Cartesian coordinate system of more than three dimensions is a near impossible task for most people. Unlike in Cartesian coordinates, in parallel coordinates, all axes are parallel to each other and equally spaced (the spacing between adjacent axes is typically of unit length) as shown in

Figures 5-14 of the patent application. In an n-dimensional space, there are n parallel axes (A1, A2, ..., An) each representing a separate variable. To plot an n-dimensional point (a1, a2, ..., an), adjacent values on their respective vertical axes are connected by a line for a total of (n-1) connected line segments. In this way, parallel coordinates allow the visualization of higher order geometries in an easily understood two-dimensional representation. Parallel coordinates are able to display correlations and patterns in multidimensional data sets. It is clear that the (bid) lines in the claimed, novel, combined Cartesian/parallel coordinate system are used in a completely different way and mean completely different notions from the line charts of a vanilla Cartesian coordinate system, despite the seeming similarity. Also, it is clear that the way this combined Cartesian/parallel coordinate system displays multidimensional/multivariate data is fundamentally different from that of the vanilla Cartesian system such as the radar charts, because the basic concept of the coordinate system is different

Thus, the subject invention uses database, display and filtering features that are unique to the subject invention and are not those capabilities provided by generic Internet based search engines and display systems. Therefore, the subject invention is not obvious over the prior art or Jones as the visual display is provided both graphically (Cartesian coordinate system) and textually (general information display).

With respect to claims 1 - 3, claims 1 - 3 do not specify the use of the Internet as suggested in the office action. Claims 1 - 3 require, "...purchasing products and services over a **network**..." The reference cited by the Examiner (page 3, lines 9 - 18) identifies the bid/sell process that occurs within the e-marketplace. The e-marketplace is defined by the subject invention on page 2, lines 5 - 6 as being performed, "...over the World Wide Web portion of the Internet." The subject invention does not require the Internet as the network. Claim 1 also requires, "...receiving at least one bid over the network..." while the reference cited by the Examiner on page 5, lines 5 - 6 requires that the information be received as Web pages. Receipt of bids as Web pages can significantly restrict the performance of the bid process. As noted above, the use of the Web pages as the source may limit the

type of filtering and attribute sorting that is possible. As discussed in the patent application on page 16, lines 11 through page 18, line 10, the display capabilities require various filtering means and selection means specific to the user. These type of filter means may not be available if the Web page displays are used as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, as the prior art is limited to the Internet as the network and uses only the Web pages provided by the Internet as the graphical data source there is no combination of the prior art either individually or combined with Jones that would result in the features and requirements of the subject invention.

Regarding claims 4 - 7, these claims are associated with obtaining and displaying detailed information relative to an attribute selected by the user. The reference cited by the Examiner (page 6, lines 17 - 20) related to selecting a bid for purchase. Furthermore, the prior art specifically states that any additional information is read from a Web page (page 6, lines 13 - 17). This information is not necessarily ranked/scored or presented in the format of the subject invention. Specifically, the subject invention requires that the information be displayed in a separate window and the discussion on page 16, lines 11 through page 18, line 10 clearly identifies the different types of filtering to be provided by the subject invention. Therefore, the subject invention is not obvious over the prior art described in pages 1 - 6, alone or in combination with Jones, as the prior art limits the process to the information, format and filtering capabilities as provided by third-party web pages.

With respect to claims 8 - 10, the Examiner states that these claims recite limitations similar to those of claims 2 - 4 and 7. Again, this is not the same as the prior art. Claim 10 requires that the information be provided in any one of multiple formats (e.g., audio, test, image, cartoon, etc.). As the prior art discussion requires Web pages as the source of the data, there is no ability of the subject invention to dictate the format of the attribute information. As discussed above, the subject invention requires that the display and filtering of the attribute and bid information be created with the user specific criteria, the prior art cannot provide this as it is limited to the use of Web pages for information display.

Regarding claims 11 - 13, page 6, lines 17 - 20 do not discuss tagging as defined by the subject invention. The reference cited by the Examiner is only concerned with the identification of a specific bid for purchase. Claim 11 uses the tagging feature as a means to further filter the information to allow the user to analyze different attributes before making a purchase decision. The selection (in the prior art discussion cited by the Examiner is select for purchase and not for filtering as required by claim 11.

As for claims 14 - 18, the Examiner acknowledges that display as discussed by the subject invention is not provided by the prior art and/or Jones. The display and its required filtering as described in the specification is unique to the subject invention and is not obvious as argued by the Examiner. The display of bid count is relative to the base claim which requires the displays to be filtered according to user requirements and not displayed or filtered as determined by the web page designer. Thus, dependent claims 14 - 18 incorporate the features of claim 1 and are not obvious in their intent or purpose since the display is specific to the bid process defined by claim 1.

Regarding claims 19 - 30, the Examiner has cited that these claims recite similar claims to those specified in claims 1 - 18. As such, the same arguments that discuss how these claims are not obvious apply to these claims as well.

In summary, the prior art requires the use of the Internet and the Web pages to provide, display and filter the bid information. The subject invention has clearly identified that the display and filtering of the information is separate from and unique to that which is provided through the network. Therefore, the prior art either individually or in combination with Jones cannot provide the features of the subject invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1 - 30 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at 703-787-9400

YOR920010159

09/800,664

00280670PA

(fax: 703-787-7557; email: mike@wcc-ip.com) to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

If an extension of time is required for this response to be considered as being timely filed, a conditional petition is hereby made for such extension of time. Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account 50-0510 (IBM-Yorktown).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mike Whitham", written over a horizontal line.

Michael E. Whitham
Reg. No. 32,635

Whitham, Curtis, Christofferson & Cook, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, VA 20190
703-787-9400
703-787-7557 (fax)